

ORIGINAL

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

L.C. ELDRIDGE SALES CO., LTD.,
LESEMAN DAVIS LLC,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JURONG SHIPYARD PTE, LTD.,
et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 6:11-cv-599-MHS

VERDICT FORM

In answering these questions, you are to follow the instructions I have given you in the Charge of Court.

1. Did the Plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the Defendants directly infringed any of the claims of the '828 Patent identified below?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each Defendant and each claim:

Defendants	Rig	Claim 1	Claim 13	Claim 14	Claim 15
Seadrill Americas, Inc.	Seadrill West Sirius	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Seadrill West Capricorn	yes	yes	yes	yes
Seadrill US Gulf LLC	Seadrill West Capricorn	yes	yes	yes	yes
Atwood Defendants ¹	Atwood Condor	yes	yes	yes	yes

¹ Atwood Defendants refers collectively to Atwood Oceanics Global Limited, Atwood Drilling, Inc., and Atwood Oceanics Management, Inc.

Answer this question if and only if you have found at least one claim of the '828 patent directly infringed.

2. If you found that a Defendant infringed one or more claims of the '828 Patent, did the Plaintiffs prove by a preponderance of the evidence that Jurong Shipyard Pte. Ltd. induced the infringement of the claims of the '828 Patent listed below?

Defendant	Rig	Claim 1	Claim 13	Claim 14	Claim 15
Jurong Shipyard Pte. Ltd.	Seadrill West Sirius	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Seadrill West Capricorn	yes	yes	yes	yes
	Atwood Condor	yes	yes	yes	yes

WAS

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each Defendant that you answered "Yes" to at least one claim listed in Questions 1 or 2.

3. If you found that a Defendant infringed one or more claims of the '828 Patent, did the Plaintiffs prove by clear and convincing evidence that the infringing Defendant willfully infringed the '828 Patent?

Jurong Shipyard Pte. Ltd.

yes

Seadrill Americas Inc.

yes

Seadrill US Gulf LLC

yes

Atwood Defendants

yes

4. Did Defendants prove by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims are invalid?

Answer "Yes" or "No" for each claim and basis:

Claim	Anticipation	Obviousness
1	No	No
13		No
14		No
15		No

If you answered Yes to any claim included in Questions 1 or 2 with respect to the Seadrill West Sirius Rig and further if you have not determined that such claim is invalid, then answer Question 5.

5. What sum of money do you find from a preponderance of the evidence would fairly and reasonably compensate the Plaintiffs for past infringement of the patent claims that you have found were infringed with respect to the Seadrill West Sirius rig?

\$ 217,056

MAS

If you answered Yes to any claim included in Questions 1 or 2 with respect to the Seadrill West Capricorn rig and further if you have not determined that such claim is invalid, then answer Question 6.

6. What sum of money do you find from a preponderance of the evidence would fairly and reasonably compensate the Plaintiffs for past infringement of the patent claims that you have found were infringed with respect to the Seadrill West Capricorn rig?

\$ 217,056

MMAS

If you answered Yes to any claim included in Questions 1 or 2 with respect to the Atwood Condor rig and further if you have not determined that such claim is invalid, then answer Question 7.

7. What sum of money do you find from a preponderance of the evidence would fairly and reasonably compensate the Plaintiffs for past infringement of the patent claims that you have found were infringed with respect to the Atwood Condor rig?

\$ 217,056

ms

The foreperson must initial and date this document in the spaces provide below as the unanimous verdict of the jury:

11/22/13
Date

LSR
FOREPERSON INITIALS

MAH